

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Editor.

Communications for the Editorial Department should be addressed, Editor New National Era, Lock Box 31, Washington, D. C.

Business letters and communications from subscribers and advertisers should be addressed, Publishers New National Era, Lock Box 31.

This paper is not responsible for the views expressed by Correspondents.

Mr. Lewis W. Stevenson is a duly authorized General Agent for the New National Era in the State of Texas.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1870.

EXTRA OFFER!

GOOD ONLY TO JANUARY 1, 1871.

NOW IS THE TIME TO SUBSCRIBE.

We will send both the NEW NATIONAL ERA and the American Agriculturist one year to every subscriber who shall forward us \$3 before the first of January next. All orders mailed prior to that date will be included in this offer.

The New National Era Free!

We will send our paper free until the 1st of January next to all subscribers who forward us \$2.50 for the year 1871 before the 15th of December.

Subscription Price of the New National Era.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

1 copy one year.....	\$2 50
1 copy six months.....	1 25
1 copy three months.....	65
5 copies one year.....	10 00
5 copies six months.....	5 50
10 copies one year.....	20 00
10 copies six months.....	10 00

Do not delay subscribing. If it is not convenient to subscribe for a year, send \$1.25 for six months. If it costs a little personal sacrifice the investment will pay.

To prevent loss send all money in Post Office Orders, Registered Letters, or Drafts.

ALL POSTMASTERS ARE OBLIGED TO REGISTER LETTERS WHENEVER REQUESTED TO DO SO.

The fee for registering is fifteen cents.

Address—
Publishers New National Era,
Lock Box No. 31,
Washington, D. C.

We take pleasure in commending Mrs. LOUISE C. BUTLER as an agent to procure subscribers to the NEW NATIONAL ERA in the District of Columbia. Mrs. BUTLER is fully accredited, and all receipts given by her to subscribers will be held valid at this office.

The President's Message.

It is safe to predict for this remarkably able and comprehensive state paper, embracing subjects of very great variety and delicacy, upon which there have been much division of opinion and not a little difference of feeling, a more hearty and general approval by the press and people of the United States than usually falls to the lot of such messages. The President has shown himself not less courageous as a statesman than he is known to be brave as a warrior. He treats the San Domingo question with an eloquence and an earnestness which will surprise some who have considered his position on that subject the weak side of his policy; and we are much mistaken if his arguments do not convince as well as surprise. He has dealt with unflinching firmness with the Canadian fishery and Alabama questions, as well as with our right to a free navigation of the St. Lawrence to the sea. In all that is said on these subjects, perhaps the most delicate of any that enter into its composition, the message will be sustained by the country, and this not less for its boldness than for its justness. There is in it a determination to bring these knotty questions with Great Britain to a certain and speedy settlement, and thus to put an end to the irritation they inevitably cause between the two countries. Neither England nor America can well afford to be long involved in wrangling diplomacy about Alabama claims and fishery questions; and the firmness of President GRANT, as evinced in this great state paper, must have the good effect of bringing matters between the two countries, without delay, to an issue.

In England, of course, the message will sound somewhat insolent, if not defiant; but this, however much to be deplored, could not have been avoided without failing of the wise purpose of bringing to an end questions sure to breed mischief at no distant future if permitted to remain the subjects of contention between the two countries. There is always something harsh in any announcement, however smoothly worded, of the purpose of a nation to protect its own rights and redress its own wrongs; yet this is the best way often to prevent the necessity of executing that purpose, by violence. General GRANT has earned for himself the reputation of meaning just what he says about every subject upon which he takes occasion to speak, and this will give weight and importance to what he says in his message on this subject, both at home and abroad.

The friends of equal rights of all colors have especial reason to congratulate themselves upon having in General GRANT a sound and consistent Republican President. The high claims of justice, liberty, and humanity seem to have been present and deeply felt by him, both at the beginning and at the end of his message. At the beginning he alludes to the obstructions thrown in the way of equal suffrage in certain States lately in rebellion, and at the end of his address, it will be seen, that he returns to the same subject, thus making it first and last of his policy.

In conclusion, I would sum up the policy of the administration to be a thorough enforcement of every law; a faithful collection of every tax provided for; economy in the disbursement of the same; a prompt payment of every debt of the nation; a reduction of taxes as rapidly as the requirements of the country will admit; reduction of taxation and tariff, to be so arranged as to afford the greatest relief to the greatest number; honest and fair dealing with all other peoples, to the end that war may be avoided, but without surrendering any right or obligation due to us; a reform in the treatment of Indians and in the whole civil service of the country; and, finally, in securing a pure, untrammelled ballot where every man entitled to cast a vote may do so just once at each election without fear of intimidation or proscription on account of his political faith, nativity, or color.

We commend this message to the careful and cordial perusal of all our readers. There is much in it upon which we would be glad, did our space permit, to make further remarks. The matters of "revenue reform" and "civil service reform" are disposed of in a manner well calculated to silence the unjust and mischievous criticisms which have been, either openly or insidiously, made upon the present administration of late. Of course the message will be assailed in certain quarters. No paper, whether from earth or sky, man or angel, can escape this criticism in our free country, but with its free press and its free platform; but it will as well support itself with the American people as any paper that was ever submitted to their candid judgment.

Unusual interest is generally felt in this (the

thirty) session of the Forty-first Congress. It assembles at a critical period in the history of our political experience, and amid a perfect tumult of conflicting interests. The representatives of contradictory opinions are bold and fierce in the assertion of them, and some doubt prevails as to whether the flexibility and toughness of party organizations can withstand the force of the abundant explosive materials known to be "bottled up" within them. It is, however, the condition of the parties, rather than the inherent difficulties of the situation, which is just now the chief ground of solicitude. Men are looking ahead with something of the anxiety of a sea captain who, after a perilous voyage, is approaching a more perilous coast. This session of Congress, meeting half way between '68 and '72, occupies a pivotal position, and is expected to indicate the policy fatal to triumph in the succeeding Presidential canvass. It may be worth while for us, though pretending to no great skill in such matters, to throw out such thoughts as we have in respect to the present juncture of our politics, more especially as we, in some measure, speak for, to a peculiar people, a class more vitally interested in the complexion of the immediate political future than any other in the country. With others dollars and cents are involved, with us the dearest interests known to the heart of man are involved. The scale has not to turn even a hair's breadth, and, as people newly raised to the enjoyment of life and liberty, we may be hurled as in the twinkling of an eye into the regions of doubt and danger, if not positive ruin.

If we look to our ancient enemy, the Democratic party, we shall find it remarkably active and vigilant, and withal (as it well may be) much encouraged. Its appetite for office has been whetted by nearly a dozen years of starvation, till it has become, Cassius like, lean and desperate. It cannot be denied that this old party has some reason to be cheered by the political prospect. The efforts it is now making to secure the confidence of the American people, and destroy their confidence in the Republican party, have thus far met with downright success.

All the late rebel States, and some of the Northern States, attest the rising power of the Democratic party. It is neither honest nor prudent to under-estimate the power of an enemy, and we do not assent to any such folly in respect to this superlative enemy, which, indeed, combines the malice of a whole nation against our race. It embraces and hurls against us all the Irish animosity of the North, and all the malice of disappointed ambition and an overthrown rebellion in every rebel State. The triumphs of that party are marked by increased contempt for our rights and our manhood everywhere, and in most of the Southern States with bloody Ku-Klux persecution. Could that party have been in the ascendant during the late elections but few, if any, colored voters, notwithstanding the law, would have been permitted to have cast a ballot. Yet this party does not despair of ultimately so shaping political events as to obtain a large share of colored voters, and by means of these obtain the Presidency in 1872. Caljory and intimidation are its means in the South, and ignoring the old issues is its policy at the North.

With a craftiness which would be admirable in a good cause, the leaders of the Democratic party have been endeavoring by various expedients to split, divide, and distract the Republican party. Estimable Republicans have been drawn into schemes with taking names by the wiles of these leaders, with a view to a rupture of the Republican party. "Civil service reform," "revenue reform," "labor reform," "temperance reform," have all been made to serve the ends of a party that never did, never will, and never can reform anything, but which, from the nature of its elements, made up, as it is, mainly of the malign and reckless portion of the people, must be the bulwark of every social and political abuse, and the stronghold of every ancient wrong in the community. While there are many bad men in the Republican party, there is no question that it contains a vastly larger percentage of the better qualities of the American people than the Democratic party; that, in fact, it drew into it, by its loyalty and patriotism in the nation's trial-hour, the best men the country has to give to any party. But we need not stay to speak of this at this point.

The Republican leaders in the present Congress have an occasion on which, and a cause for which, to exercise all their wisdom, firmness, and statesmanship. The country needs this, and the efficiency and permanence of the party itself require it. The trouble would be less serious if the Republican party had to contend with open and undisguised enemies, or with the natural antagonisms of rival interests—such as free trade and tariff. The trouble is deeper down than this. There are, unhappily, rival ambitions and pretensions to be dealt with and disposed of, wisely and firmly; and it remains to be seen whether the Republican party in Congress has the courage to apply unflinchingly to the obvious and necessary principles to the case in hand.

The worst of all foes are those of one's household. Often the very men who have been most petted and exalted are the first to plunge the dagger of treachery and ingratitude into the heart of the party which has lifted them from the depths of obscurity to the height of public honor and distinction. There is but one proper way of dealing with all such, and that is to unmask them and cast them out, send them where they belong, and have done with them.

While parties are not absolute, and may at proper times be disbanded, there are honorable ways of asserting individual independence as against parties, and honorable ways for disbanding them. We should tolerate no dallying, no playing fast and loose. An offense against the Republican party committed, no matter how far from the capital of the nation, is an offense against the party in every part of the nation, and should be so regarded and treated. The body is more important than any one or two of its members. "If it right hand offend thee cut it off," is as good in politics as in morals; and what is done should be done promptly. There should be no hesitation in dealing with traitors who remain with us only the better to injure us and to serve the enemy. Hesitation only encourages audacity and increases the mischief to be avoided or remedied. When a man is not for us he is against us, and the wisest course is to make short work with him, and send him to his own place. The COWANS, the DIXONS, the DOOLITTLES, and the JOHNSONS did the Republican party incomparably more injury within the party than when outside. BRECKENRIDGE was a far greater danger to the loyal cause during his stay in the Senate than when he escaped to the camp of the enemy and drew his sword for the rebellion. Their example should not be lost upon us, nor upon their imitators. There is but one way to maintain the integrity and efficiency of any political party; and that is, while allowing the widest range of freedom to its individual members in discussion, to demand unanimity and conformity in party action.

This may seem harsh and tyrannical, but it is not so; it is only the wise and necessary exclusion of the case from the party.

and better way shall be devised and put into practice this country cannot be governed but by one party or another. On all questions which divide parties, individualism should, and ought to, give way to the claims of party. He whose conscience is not equal to this should, like our friend GEN. SMITH, of New York, act independently of all parties, or keep up a small party of his own. He is too noble to stab the Republican party in New York and seek its society and honors in Washington, and hence we have no quarrel with him, though even he would do better service to his country inside the Republican party than outside of it, as indeed would also the wondrously-gifted WENDELL PHILLIPS, who led astray twenty thousand votes in Massachusetts. But these gentlemen are open and honorable in their opposition to the Republican party; and the effect of their political action is in no wise so damaging as is that of Messrs. SCHURZ, BROWN, COX, and others, who, in the name of fidelity to the Republican cause, give victory to its enemies.

It may be said that something is due these gentlemen for past services; that they were faithful in the hour of the nation's greatest need; that they are able and eloquent men, distinguished for rectitude of character and purity of intention, and much else of the same sort. In answer we can only point to our cause betrayed in Missouri; to North Carolina in the hands of the Ku-Klux; to Tennessee, unsafe in many parts off for a Union man outside of his door after nightfall; to Virginia, given over to the Democratic party, and only decent because within reach of federal power; to Florida, scarcely saved; to Alabama, so far gone from the Union and loyalty that there is no shadow of hope that she will return in a generation; to Georgia, in much the same condition, and the list might be increased. What has done this? Unquestionably one agent in this mischief has been the absence of that wholesome discipline in the Republican party that makes every man feel his personal responsibility to the party, and that he cannot play fast and loose in it with impunity. The Republican party is either worth preserving or it is fit only to be destroyed. If the former, we cannot guard it too carefully or support it too stringently; if the latter, let us have a manly call for its disbandment or its reconstruction, and have its remains honorably disposed of. But while it exists, while we are connected with it, let us at least be true to its claims upon us, and not wear our relation to it only as a cloak to conceal the dagger with which to stab its life away. In this Congress let the camp be searched, let the disaffected and unreliable be made manifest, and let all who mean to maintain the Republican party, not only for the good it has done, but for the good it may yet do, stand firmly together and give General GRANT's administration the full and earnest support of the national organization, of which he is the able and true, as well as the highest, representative.

Casting Its Shadow Before.

The Legislature elected by the Ku-Klux rebels of North Carolina assembled at Raleigh on Monday, the 21st ultimo. Its organization illustrates its character and purpose. One W. L. SAMPSON, chief of the "Invisible Empire," the name the Ku-Klux assassins have assumed, was elected Secretary of the Senate, and T. J. DAVIS, a member of the same treasonable organization, was elected Speaker of the House. Both branches of the Legislature of North Carolina are, therefore, under the control of, and their course will be dictated by, that reasonable band of conspirators. Having commenced its work by thus casting its shadow before it, no one will be surprised at any reasonable work the Legislature may do.

One of its acts was to adjourn for the purpose of attending the Lee memorial service, and ordering the American flag on the State Capital raised at half-mast in honor of the architect. Every public building was draped in mourning during the ceremonies, and the Odd-Fellows, Masons, fire companies, Sabbath schools, and members of the Legislature formed the procession. Ex-Governor VANCE, one of the ranciest traitors during the rebellion, and still unrepentant and malignant, delivered the panegyric upon the dead traitor.

For his reasonable services against the Government VANCE has since been elected to the United States Senate, though ineligible, as he and those who elected him know. His animosity to the Government has been so bitter that he has steadily refused to ask for the removal of his disabilities; and he and his rebel party have now resolved to defy the laws of Congress designed to keep such "pestilent fellows out of its halls."

This is what the Ku-Klux Legislature of the State has already done, and it very clearly forebodes what it is still resolved to do. It gives the country far warning that the rebels of North Carolina are still in arms against the Government and still fighting for the "lost cause." Their next step in this direction will be the impeachment and removal of the loyal Governor and Supreme Judges of the State. They threatened this revolutionary movement immediately after the election. Their organization of the Legislature in the interest and by the Ku-Klux assassins, their dedication of the traitor Lee, and the election of even a worse traitor, if that were possible, to the Senate of the United States, leave not the slightest room to doubt that they will carry out the threat to the very letter. This measure is necessary to give them absolute, uncontrolled power to carry out their other wicked plans; and they are not the men, as they have proved, to scruple at any crime which will promote their conspiracy against the Government.

The State of North Carolina has been lost to the Republican party by the votes of loyal men. The lesson which the Legislature thus brought into power, is teaching the country—if not that taught by Tennessee, Georgia, and Virginia—should well warn all intelligent and honest Republicans against being caught in this rebel trap hereafter. There is not an instance in which either individual Republicans or the country have gained anything by such a change of rulers. On the contrary, they have always been cheated, and lost the ground they possessed.

The only safety of the people, therefore, is in faithfully adhering to the Republican party, and looking to it for the protection of their rights. If abuses have crept into it, insist on their correction. To aid their opponents into power for some personal reason would be as foolish and wicked as for soldiers in the field to desert their flag and go over to the enemy because they imagined their officers might not always be as brave and honest as they ought. That would be treason as well as stupidity.

If a Senator in each of the Republican States had adopted the course General SCHURZ did in Missouri—bolted the nominations made by the Republican party for some real or imagined mistake, and united with the Democrats to defeat the Republican and elect the Democratic ticket—the result would have been the loss of several Republican States, and in giving the Democrats a majority in the House of Representatives, thus completely paralyzing the administration and defeating all Republican legis-

lation to produce this result, and no thanks are due him that the next House of Representatives will not have a Democratic majority, and the efforts of the Republican party to carry forward the great work so well begun rendered utterly powerless.

St. Paul's Bachelor Views.

BY F. H. FLETCHER.

In the Era of November 24th is an extract from the Independent, to be found under the above caption. We perused it attentively, being among those who not only greatly esteem the ordination and work of the great Apostle, but, confess, to ability as well as earnestness. But though the article is from the pen of one who, besides planning his campaign, fights it out, we realized our worst fears that the views would be entirely misinterpreted. Indeed, they not only misrepresent, but make the Apostle to talk foolishness, or it is that Mr. Tilton, like the Turks at the battle of the Pyramids, has faced his guns in the wrong direction? Ordinarily we would not attack the views of one so powerful as he without better information and more experience in abstract matters; but he has gone from his castle, not upon the open plain, but into the castle of another, even into the castle of the consistency of God's Word. He swings a trenchant blade, but it cuts the air only. He gallantly strikes where he thinks the enemy is, but it is random work, and shows he does not know how to discern him.

In short, we agree that the proposition to settle social questions by Scriptural quotations will fail: 1st. As all Scriptural precepts enjoining rules of conduct are especially to the peculiar people of God. 2d. That these Scriptures distinctly define the difference between the people of God and the people of this world. 3d. That these divisions represent nations diametrically opposed, as good and evil. 4th. The application can only be limitedly applied, and that because of the greater truth of Christianity. 5th. St. Paul's letter is to the peculiar people of God, and not to the world.

At the outset the Independent misses the mark, inasmuch as Paul did not write to settle social questions at large, and is therefore free from the imputed inconsistency which men take of the Scriptures to make them prove anything. Paul did not write to the whole city of Corinth, but to the class designated in Chapter I, verses 1 and 2. In the tenth verse of the letter is stated, and in the whole chapter he distinguishes between the people of God and the people of the world. (See 21st to 30th verses, especially to this point.) Is this hard to understand, or does he fail to designate this peculiar people in the closing verses of the chapter? How, then, can his teaching apply to the world at large unless by gross misapprehension of this distinction? This, indeed, brings primitive and true Christianity into direct antagonism with the views held by Mr. Tilton. But this distinction is easily pointed out in all the sacred works, and the evidence of its truth committed only to hearts regenerated by the spirit of God. These teachings do not apply to the world, and cannot but be limitedly applied, if at all, because the spirit of the world is in antagonism to the spirit of Grace. Read the 21st chapter, 12th verse, also the 13th, and finish the chapter if yet any doubt remains of the character of the people addressed. If yet there remains doubt, read Titus, 2d chapter, 11th to 15th verses, and Romans, 12th chapter, 2d verse, all among his writings, and proving rather conclusively that he knew what he was about.

Paul wrote to settle social difficulties in the church, and by the first verse of the 7th chapter we find it in answer to a letter upon the subject of marriage and divorce—a delicate subject even in the church. Question: Does he recommend unconditional celibacy? We answer emphatically, No! and cite the ninth verse in proof, having previously said in substance that the tendency to marriage is a gift to men, and lays down the principle that different gifts tend to different actions. He advocates celibacy, not for the world, but for the church, on only one reason—a great reason indeed to the church, but doubtless to many of the world a foolish one. See the 32d verse, in which he shows how celibacy may be improved by greater sanctification and less worldly care in the appreciation of that privilege. In the spirit of Christian teaching, then, his asseveration, "It is good for them if they abide even as I," was correct, in that it was good, because marriage to a degree hindered complete sanctification, and celibacy promoted it. In no other place does he say celibacy is good; and here it is abstinent, commended for greater good only. Is this against his experience? (See the 7th and 9th verses.) Is it against common experience? Nay, nay! Though it is not given to the guardians of common experience, but the truth, it could not be contrary to rightful experience, because it results from the only spirit which discerns the things of the heart, and shows man as he is and how he is situated. We could elaborate here with profit to prove that Paul had the true wisdom of the matter.

Paul not only advocated celibacy for a reason unknown to the world and for a greater good, but he was an unconditional advocate of marriage, and a firm opponent of marital separation. He does not count the sixth or preceding chapter—and so we rule out the term divorce. Indeed, always consistent in his teaching, we think he would have denied and reprimanded an attempt to seek separation of the law. In considering his views of marital separation, we find Paul dividing married believers into two classes—to whom the Lord speaks and to whom he speaks—being, respectively, first and second. The first class are instructed in the 10th and 11th verses; the second class in the 12th to 15th verses, inclusive. The first class are those where both couples are believers; the second class are those where one of the couple is an unbeliever. Now, we notice that from the 10th to 18th verses in only one place he allows marital separation. It is in the 15th verse, but as unlike the rendition of the extract from the Independent as to be entirely unlike it. This is plain that all believers are enjoined not to break the marriage condition—in the language of the 17th verse, to remain in the calling wherewith they are called—and the responsibility of the separation is entirely thrown upon the unbelieving partners, who are to be permitted to depart if they desire to, and not to be hindered; for the Lord hath called us to peace, and the brother or sister is not in such cases (What cases? Of marriage or separation? Of separation, we answer) in bondage. Mr. Tilton renders this 15th verse: "If," he says, "the unbelieving husband or wife seeks for a divorce, let it not be hindered; for in such cases the unbelieving husband or wife is not bound to remain under the yoke," and excuses the unbeliever. If he strike out unbelieving, and substitute the words of the text, "brother and sister," Paul will be made to talk consistently, as he does. For, if because of difference of religion he permitted separation, he would encourage them, as witness the 35th verse. But the unalterable tenor of his instructions is for the believer to stand firm by the marriage relation; for them to marry, rather than burn, to

be consumed. Moreover, Paul teaches not only that the believer should give no offense to the unbeliever, but points to the very quiescence of the believer to peace, as an opportunity for God's mysterious providence in that the unbelieving husband or wife might be converted, and at least get good from the believing partner. Consequently it is gratuitous to speak of Paul's intolerance, or of the spirit of this religion, which teaches sublime morality to be attained by obedience to the commands of God. I know the able editor of the Independent to be a firm champion of morality. I have listened to his precepts in my Lyceum, and always, when I can, I go to get refreshed at the fountain of his wisdom. Yet here I see him losing sight of the grand, enduring lessons of Christianity—patience and meekness to do good by faith in God's providence. This is above ordinary moral precept; and this vein, by which the spirit gives its soft color and genuine strength to virtually build up man's nature in righteousness, runs through the whole Scriptures, and enters into their interpretation as of a language and a people foreign to the inhabitants of this world.

Of course we argue this case as of experience, believing, among evidence, that the Christian religion emanating from God must be perfect in its adaptation to the Church in all time, under like circumstances, and take to witness the address of Paul, which, we rejoice, includes us. On the contrary, the editor argues from observation, and does not understand that opinion-to-day is governed by opinion nearly nineteen hundred years old. In the world it is not so; but in the Church, as known by Scripture teaching, there is no change, the institution being perfect, and comprehending and suiting the cases of all God's people. And though we confess there is little externally of the Church to show the rigid observance required by the rigidly teaching, I cannot agree that Paul to-day would annul his instructions relative to marriage. The Church may have changed, the peculiar people may be swallowed in the body politic, but the truth of God must stand, and the evidence of conversion and Christian walk not differ from that laid out in the New Testament. This is the marrow of Christianity to detect the work of the Spirit. These are the same, and certainly must be the instructions. And, however we rescue Paul from inconsistent advocacy, we could desire that his teaching could be applied to the world at large, well subsoiled by the spirit of righteousness, to bring forth fruit. But, ere we arrive at his memorable chapter on marriage, he shows why this cannot be, because of an essential and individual work preliminary. If, also, the perfection of the Gospel shows the statesmanship of the head of the Church, it must also witness to his teachers, and there be consistency in all that appertains to it. It is so with the evidence—not in observation, but in spirit. We conclude, then, our defence of the precious Scriptures and their teaching, because they to us are more than all we know by the senses, and contain salvation; because they are real vital good to men, and of them is known our true relation to the Creator.

SALISBURY, MASS., NOV. 28, 1870.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE.

"The New Village."

POTOMAC CITY, D. C., Dec. 5, 1870.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

On Thursday evening, December 2, a large concourse of people met at the Howard School House of "Potomac City" to witness the presentation of an organ to the children of the Pioneer Sunday School.

The room was thronged. Every available spot where a human being could find lodgment was appropriated, and numbers were obliged to remain outside.

The audience embraced at once the greatest and the least of America's citizens. It numbered one whose name is known wherever the English language is spoken. It embraced as well the untutored freedman, the knowledge of whose existence is limited to his own hearthstone.

The presentation address, by Mr. Lewis Douglass, was truly characteristic—brief, comprehensive, and to the point.

The reply, by the superintendent, S. G. Brown, was in harmony with the address; the "hushed household, the desert-like stillness" pervading amid the packed assemblage, was testimony that all who listened were interested and well entertained.

The organ, under the manipulations of Mrs. Lewis Douglass, discoursed sweet music, while the trained voices of the Sunday School choir were in strict accord with its melody.

One of the pleasing and long-to-be-remembered features of the evening's entertainment was the music, vocal and instrumental, by the choir of the Asbury Sunday School, of Washington city.

The most frigid philosopher, deaf to the melodious strains of the human voice, could not have been indifferent; his heart would have melted while listening to the concord of sweet sounds.

The evening was one of the brightest, everything seemed to combine to kindle joy in the veins of all present.

The Hon. Frederick Douglass, the Representative man of his race, the intellectual embodiment of his people, was unanimously called upon for a "speech."

While he was speaking these words came to mind: "His Minerva is born in panny." * * * You never catch his mind in an undress. He brings his total wealth into company, and gravely unpacks it. His riches are always about him. * * * He always keeps the path. You cannot make excursions with him, for he gets you right. * * * His morality never abates. He cannot compromise, or understand middle actions. There can be but a right and a wrong. His conversation is a book.

The speeches on the part of the Reverend gentlemen, Messrs. Draper and Arnold, together with those of Mr. S. L. Sleigh, Mr. P. T. Bell, and Mr. Joseph Ambush, were loudly applauded.

This entertainment over, the crowd was invited to another feast, tastefully and temptingly spread out in an adjacent room. The utmost good feeling prevailed.

Then and now. In looking over the children comprising this Pioneer Sunday School one is put upon a train of speculation as to their future. When looking over this people so recently invested with the rights of citizenship, and surrounded or permitted to enjoy the privileges guaranteed, one marvels at the transition.

Suffice it to say the whole affair was unquestionably a success. "INDEPENDENT."

Letter from Manchester, Ohio.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

MANCHESTER, OHIO, Nov. 25, 1870.

SIR: Being highly pleased with the NEW NATIONAL ERA, and the manner in which it is conducted, I thought I would write you a letter, expressing my pleasure that we have once more a newspaper that we can point to with pride as a sample of what the colored people are capable of doing as freemen and citizens. The want of such a paper has been long felt, and its appearance at this time, with the "Old

promise of its success.

Knowing that you would like to hear from your correspondents the opinions of the people in their respective communities upon the political questions of the day, I will proceed to "jut" down a few "items" in regard to some of the subjects that are mostly talked of just now. I will commence by referring to the "Cox imbroglio," out of which some of the Republican and all of the Democratic papers are trying to make so much political capital at the expense of the President. I find that, while a few of the Republicans here have been blinded into taking sides with the Secretary, (through his loud protestations of "reform" in his Department,) yet the largest portion of them see through the flimsy guise, and mean to stand by the Executive until they see some better reasons for deserting him than Mr. Cox and his friends would imply. The fact is, Mr. Cox's present attitude corresponds with his actions in the past. His political record, never very bright, grows darker with each move he makes in politics; and those of us who remember his cowardly attempt to smother the negro suffrage agitation (in his reply to the "Oberlin" letter) can well understand why he is now, as ever, "in the right church, but in the wrong pew"—i. e., a Democrat in Republican guise.

Apocryphal of politics, I notice that Mr. Vallandigham, in a speech delivered at Dayton, Ohio, October 12, 1870, felt called upon to give the colored voters some "good advice" as to how they should conduct themselves as voters and citizens! He advised them "not to vote as a distinct body," but "divide up among the different political parties." Now, as there are but two political parties in this country at present, of course a part would have to be Democrats and a part Republicans. Well, this may (?) be all very good in its place, but such "advice" comes with a very bad grace from a man who has endeavored all his life to keep this same class of persons under foot, but who have (in spite of all his efforts to keep them down) been raised to the dignity of citizens; and I think the best thing in consistency that Mr. Vallandigham can do in this matter will be to keep silent, so far as giving advice to colored voters is concerned. We have got our privileges without his assistance, and in spite of his opposition, and, with God's help, we will exercise them without his advice. More anon.

JOHN M. TYRE.

Letter from Trenton, N. J.

TRENTON, N. J., Dec. 1st, 1870.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

New Jersey is "right side up with care!" We have met the enemy, and the victory is ours. We have elected three members of Congress out of five, and a majority of twelve on joint ballot, nine in the House and three in the Senate; thus insuring us a Republican United States Senator for seven years from the 4th of March next. We lost our candidate in the Second Congressional District through the disaffection of the party in one of the counties, who would not vote the straight ticket because one of their own men, who was a candidate, did not get the nomination. The county, hitherto Republican by a majority of six or seven hundred, gave him barely a majority. Burlington county is its name, and the nominee is Hon. Wm. A. Newell, ex-Governor of the State, and one of the ablest and most influential men in the State.

The colored troops fought bravely, and voted almost a solid ticket. By the colored vote the victory was achieved. The party is entirely too conservative in this State. They still ignore the propriety and necessity of colored men holding office. This policy they will have to inaugurate if they would in the future consolidate and secure the colored vote. Some of the emoluments we are entitled to and must have. They are doubtless knowing to the fact that we hold the balance of power, and that we have some men among us qualified to fill some of the positions sought after, and that we are entitled to consideration according to our quota of representation.

Let us have fair play, and we will be found firm and reliable. The fidelity of the colored man cannot be depended on any longer than they deal justly and honestly with him. I hope they will see this, and act accordingly, by hoisting the Radical flag until Conservatism is driven out of the ranks. Then will we have a strong, united, and victorious party, who will have learned in time the good old maxim that "honesty is the best policy."

The Supreme Court is now in session and the grand jury is hearing evidence against the rioters at the polls in Newton Township, (Camden, New Jersey,) Camden County. We have some fifty or more colored men as witnesses in behalf of the Government. Their testimony is clear, direct, and conclusive, and I think we will be able to board some of the offenders here free of charge for some years. Jersey justice is a terror to evildoers.

Yours, in behalf of justice and right,

WM. E. WALKER.

John Stuart Mill.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTRY.

Close to Avignon, the old city of the Popes, there is a white marble tomb raised by an Englishman to the memory of an Englishman who lies beneath, and whom he loved with a love romantic as that of a medieval chivalier, reverential and sacred as the homage of a votary at a shrine. I know no words, in any language, more pathetic than those in which the bereaved husband has recorded his deep love for the lost wife. I know of no panegyric ever lavished by poet on his mistress more exalted than that he devoted to her virtues and her genius. Nothing half so noble as the homage and homage is contained in the melodious lines of the great poet whose fantastic passion is always associated with that famed Valence which he is to wear. To me the love and sorrow of Petrarch are nothing like so touching as the love and the sorrow of John Stuart Mill for a wife who is buried at Avignon.

When Mill can steal away from Parliamentary life he hurries away to the south of France and to the tomb of Petrarch. He is not content with reading all that has read or heard of the tribute of lofty and pathetic eloquence which Mill paid to the goodness and the genius of his wife, and which serves as an introduction to the "Essay on Liberty." Was Mrs. Mill all that her husband describes her? Had she an intellect immeasurably superior to his own? Was hers, as in another passage he declares, a mind equal to that of Shakespeare or Plato? Surely not. Such minds cannot die and make no sign. There never were any minds, inferior to Mill's. But it is certain that Stuart Mill believed every word he has written of his lost wife to be the exaggerated truth. And it is certain that in the heart of the great political economist burned a love passion that could not be satisfied by the attenuated frame lives a spirit as chivalric and fearless as ever glowed under the breastplate of a Bayard.

I believe John Stuart Mill to be, on the whole, the most remarkable Englishman now living. I do not venture to say he is the greatest, although he probably is. But I am convinced that he is the most remarkable—taking mind, and character, and heart—the most independent, original, unconventional man of his day; the one who goes nearest to possessing that ideal combination of the masculine and the feminine qualities which I suppose would make the perfect man. Of his intellect I need hardly speak. Mill is quite as much read and admired in America as he is in his own country; and his influence is perhaps even more directly and generally acknowledged here than there. I rather wish to say something of the man personally, as he is one whom America is never likely to see; and who, until lately, was almost absolutely unknown to his own country-

ing anything like the same amount of influence as ever so absolutely anonymous a voice, and nothing more, as Mill was in England; and to the time of the last general election. Carlyle lives a retired life; but everybody living in London may see Carlyle, and one meets everywhere a man who knows him. I have myself a tolerably extended acquaintance with him, and I have seen him in London, and up to the time I speak of, I only knew two men who had ever spoken to Mr. Mill. Of late he has accepted all the support of the Parliamentary life cordially and cheerfully, and he is now in London during the session, and he is not only appearing and speaking with our great thinkers. Most people who enter one of the galleries of the House of Commons for the first time now ask almost immediately of the man who